



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, APRIL 9, 1910

No. 22

The English Classical Association held its annual meeting on January 10-11; Professor Butcher was in the chair. The first business was the discussion of the report on grammatical terminology to which I alluded recently; but most important from our point of view was the report of the Curricula Committee presented by Professor Sonnenschein upon a four-year Latin course for secondary schools in which the leaving age is about sixteen, i. e. a curriculum that would correspond pretty closely to our four year High School course. The report assumes as a minimum about 150 lessons a year, four lessons a week. The order of progress for the four years is (1) specially composed sentences for teaching the elements, (2) 'cooked' texts, (3) simplified texts, (4) unabridged texts. In vocabulary, to which the Committee attaches the greatest importance, the progress should be during the first year 500 words; in the second year 500 new words should be added, in the third year 500 words more. For the fourth year no number is assigned. The first year is confined to the regular declensions and conjugations and the commonest pronouns, with a few of the common irregular verbs, such as *eo* and *fero*. In syntax only the rules common to English and Latin are to be introduced. In the second year the simpler uses of the subjunctive are to be mastered; to the third year belong the principal parts of verbs and a thorough mastery of the principles of syntax already touched upon; in the fourth year we have a systematic review of the whole of the grammar, both accidence and syntax. Composition is to be taught throughout the four years, at first merely orally.

For the reading the following suggestions are made: second year, simplified stories from Livy, and episodes from Caesar's Gallic War; third year, abridgments of Caesar, Livy, Cicero, Vergil's Aeneid, Ovid's Fasti or Metamorphoses; fourth year, a standard prose work of not less than a thousand lines, and a standard verse work of not less than five hundred lines. In the examinations unseen passages of a style similar to those of the set books must be translated readily.

This report is of great interest to us in view of the recent report of our Commission. It differs from that in many points and our teachers will be at once struck with the small amount of ground that is expected to be covered during the first two years. In our own High Schools the highest mor-

tality is in the second year when, according to our present system, pupils have been brought face to face with Caesar en masse. This of course has been due to the necessity of covering so much prescribed work in the time set and most teachers are agreed that slower progress in the first two years would result in more rapid progress in the last two. Obviously the English report is based on that belief for not merely the amount of work but the grade of difficulty is very much less than that expected in American schools. Of course the advantage of the new requirements as outlined by our Commission is that as much flexibility is allowed as individual teachers may deem desirable and a poor class may be kept at a much slower pace than one of better quality. The English report lays emphasis upon small pieces of reading, much varied, while in the Commission's report the variation is less and the amount of any individual author is likely to be more. One would criticize the English reading as being scrappy; but this may be offset by other merits; see Miss MacVay in The Educational Review for May, 1909.

In the main, however, the English report does not vary greatly from the findings of our own Commission. Prose composition must naturally be taught throughout and emphasis on oral work is in line with the best modern thinking.

The suggestions for vocabulary are very noteworthy from our point of view; they are practically the same as I have been advocating for some time. If carried out these suggestions will require the standardizing of the vocabulary for secondary teaching, which I think very desirable and essential if examinations in sight reading are to be actually valid. Of course the recommendations of this committee apply only to a particular class of schools but it cannot fail to be gratifying that the English and American ideals for this kind of teaching are so nearly alike.

Miss MacVay shows that in actual practice more reading is done than would be supposed from the statements in the report and perhaps the variety of material may conduce somewhat to this result. Judging from our experience with prescribed reading the amount indicated in the English report ought to be much exceeded in practice, for 1,500 lines are an extremely small allowance for the fourth year; and

if we have been able to push our pupils through the first six books of the Aeneid in the fourth year with our defective methods, surely we ought to be able to do at least as much on the reformed system.

In this connection, it might be well to reiterate that our Commission was not a Commission of the American Philological Association. That body only devised a plan for the formation of the Commission at the request of the various Classical Associations. And likewise as a matter of courtesy and appreciation, the Commission presented the report to the American Philological Association before publishing it.

G. L.

AMATEUR AND PROFESSIONAL LATIN IN THE HIGH SCHOOL¹

In the course of the present wide-spread and rapidly increasing demand for revision of our educational system the question has often arisen whether Latin is of any real value in secondary education, or is merely a survival of the unfittest, as sometimes occurs where man has interfered with the operation of Nature's laws. An educational administrator of no slight importance has made the statement that "There is no doubt that the average American high school boy gets less out of Latin than out of any other subject in the curriculum". If this be true—and too many people are already announcing it as a fact—it would seem to be high time for the Latin teachers of the country to take cognizance of it. The question is neither new nor especially attractive to Latin teachers, but conditions are rapidly approaching a point where such criticisms must be met and some changes made as a matter of self defense.

Before undertaking the defense of our present position it might be well to consider why we are in this position and whether it is as strong as we can make it. We are working with a high school curriculum which is a copy, on a smaller scale, of the academic college curriculum, which, in turn, is a direct descendant of the classical schools of the middle ages. Despite the fact that the purpose and nature of the modern high school are radically different from those of the mediaeval college, the curriculum has changed but little. In Latin and Greek even the textbooks and methods of teaching have remained substantially the same. Attempts to adapt the curriculum to the conditions and theories of modern education are ridiculed as 'fads and frills' and the notorious conservatism of the pedagogue prevails in spite of constant complaint and opposition. As a result the present high school curriculum is about as adequate for the purposes of modern public education as mediaeval weapons and armor would be for modern warfare.

The existence in the high school of the present

narrow methods of Latin teaching is due primarily to the fact that in the mediaeval college which the high school represents Latin was logically and actually a technical subject. It is still a technical subject in most college work, and for that reason the college professor generally does all in his power to make Latin a technical subject in the high school. Consequently our high schools, as Dr. Wilson has said, are attempting the impossible by trying to give each pupil both a liberal and a technical education. Latin teachers are among the worst offenders in this respect, since they preach one idea and practice another. From the broad pedagogical standpoint, Latin in the high school belongs to the liberal branches of education, but we find it presented by most teachers as a technical subject, taught almost entirely for its intrinsic value. This method is radically wrong and is the weakest point in our position. It cannot be successfully defended and unless abandoned may bring Latin to the same subordinate position to which Greek has been driven.

In order to retain the position of Latin in the curriculum we should recognize the fact that Latin should be presented in public schools as a means and not as an end. This is the essential difference between high school and college Latin, and the methods of presentation should vary accordingly. With cultural or disciplinary studies the important thing is not the facts of the subject matter, but the mental training acquired in assimilating and handling those facts, and for this reason the method of presentation is of prime importance. The college professor has the comparatively easy and relatively unimportant task of teaching a few select pupils to read and write Latin. The high school teacher, on the other hand, is supposed to use Latin as a means of developing in the many thoroughness of observation, accuracy of deduction, and fluency of expression, an accomplishment far more difficult and infinitely more valuable than the mere knowledge of Latin. The college professor and his classes are ipso facto professionals, aiming usually at the highest possible technical knowledge of the subject, while the high school pupils are amateurs, taking the work for the sake of the liberal training which it is supposed to furnish. In athletics there is a well-established belief that professionalism among amateurs inevitably ruins the work by changing the point of view and raising the standard to a point which is discouraging or impossible for the average amateur. Practically the same thing occurs when the college professor is allowed to set the pace for high school Latin. The necessity of teaching technical points for examinations makes a liberal presentation of the subject impossible, while the college entrance standard imposed upon all indiscriminately produces a pressure which makes the work a discouraging task for both class and teacher. Under such con-

¹ This paper was read at the meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Haverford, Pa., April 23, 1907.